



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,451	04/30/2001	Ming Duong-van	3397P006	4450

8791 7590 10/04/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

HOM, SHICK C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2616

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/846,451

Applicant(s)

DUONG-VAN ET AL.

Examiner

Shick C. Hom

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/13/06.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2616

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, and 5-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rumsewicz (6,532,214).

Rumsewicz discloses the apparatus to control congestion in a communication network, wherein the apparatus comprises: a control node wherein the control node is located in a communication link between at least one server and at least one

Art Unit: 2616

client (see col. 1 line 54 to col. 2 line 3 which recite the node for controlling traffic in a system that provide services between customers and the service provider by monitoring average traffic profile passing through the node, detecting congestion, and invoking congestion controls clearly anticipate the control node) and a control point wherein the control point is located nearby or in the control node (see Fig. 1 which shows the control point 13 located nearby or in the control node; col. 1 lines 50-53 which recite the control point maintaining targeted level throughput; col. 14 lines 19-22 and 32-35 which recite the control point sending a congestion control signal to the control node when an overload of traffic is detected at the control point).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2616

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-2, 5-8, and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rumsewicz (6,532,214) in view of Loguinov et al. (2002/0169880).

Regarding claims 1-2, 5-8, and 10-14:

Rumsewicz discloses a method and apparatus, comprising: operating a control node of a communication network at a packet bandwidth wherein the control node is located in a communication link between at least one server and at least one client (see col. 1 line 54 to col. 2 line 3 which recite the node for controlling traffic in a system that provide services between customers and the service provider by monitoring average traffic

Art Unit: 2616

profile passing through the node, detecting congestion, and invoking congestion controls clearly anticipate the control node) and wherein the control node comprises at least one control point wherein at least one resonance of network performance metrics is determined at the control point by scanning across a range of bandwidths as in claims 1, 6, 9; and wherein the network performance metrics comprise one or more of throughput, average fetch time and packet loss as in claims 2, 7 (see Fig. 1 the control point 13; col. 1 lines 50-53 which recite the control point maintaining targeted level throughput; col. 14 lines 19-22 and 32-35 which recite the control point sending a congestion control signal to the control node when an overload of traffic is detected at the control point; and col. 4 lines 32-40 and col. 10 lines 30-32 which recite the performance measures of interest being response time, waiting time, delay, throughput, and processor utilization).

Rumsewicz discloses all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of wherein at the least one resonance of network performance metrics determined at the control point by scanning across the range of bandwidths until one or more of the network performance metrics is/are optimized, and wherein said packet bandwidth corresponds to a best observed resonance point from the at least one resonance point as in

Art Unit: 2616

claims 1, 6, and 12-13; wherein the packet bandwidth is set by varying an inter-packet delay time over selected communication links at the control node as in claims 5, 8, and wherein the control point comprises means to determine at least one resonance point of network performance metrics by scanning across a range of bandwidths until one or more of the network performance metrics is/are optimized as in claims 10-11, 14.

Loguinov et al. from the same or similar fields of endeavor teach that it is known to provide wherein at the least one resonance of network performance metrics determined at the control point by scanning across the range of bandwidths until one or more of the network performance metrics is/are optimized, and wherein said packet bandwidth corresponds to a best observed resonance point from the at least one resonance point as in claims 1, 6, and 12-13 (see paragraph 0033 and claim 1 which recite mechanism being used to achieve performance improvements including the step of determining the best bandwidth for the transmission of data packets from the server to the client clearly anticipate optimizing the network performance metrics as claimed); wherein the packet bandwidth is set by varying an inter-packet delay time over selected communication links at the control node as in claims 5, 8 (see the abstract and paragraphs 0008, 0011, and 0030 which recite generating and using different

Art Unit: 2616

inter-packet spacing for determining the bandwidth); and wherein the control point comprises means to determine at least one resonance point of network performance metrics by scanning across a range of bandwidths until one or more of the network performance metrics is/are optimized as in claims 10-11, 14 (see the abstract and paragraph 0010 which recite the method and device for estimating bottleneck bandwidth over a communication network including the step of calculating a set of bandwidth samples between the server, through the bottleneck link, and the client and determining a new bandwidth from the calculated bandwidth samples for the following transmission of data packets between the server and the client; and paragraph 0032 which recite the estimates being used for congestion control between the server system and the client system. Further, see paragraph 0033 and claim 1 which recite mechanism being used to achieve performance improvements and the step of determining the best bandwidth for the following transmission of data packets from the server to the client clearly anticipate optimizing the network performance metrics as claimed) as in claims 10-11, 14.

Thus, it would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide wherein the packet bandwidth is set by varying an inter-packet delay time over selected communication links at the



Art Unit: 2616

control node, and wherein the control point comprises means to determine at least one resonance point of network performance metrics by scanning across a range of bandwidths until one or more of the network performance metrics is/are optimized as taught by Loguinov et al. in the communications method and apparatus of Rumsewicz.

The packet bandwidth being set by varying an inter-packet delay time over selected communication links at the control node and wherein the control point comprises means to determine at least one resonance point of network performance metrics by scanning across a range of bandwidths until one or more of the network performance metrics is/are optimized can be implemented by providing the step of setting the packet bandwidth by varying an inter-packet delay time over selected communication links at the control node and providing the control point means to determine at least one resonance point of network performance metrics by scanning across a range of bandwidths until one or more of the network performance metrics is/are optimized of Loguinov et al. to the control node and control point of Rumsewicz. The motivation for using the step of setting the packet bandwidth by varying an inter-packet delay time over selected communication links at the control node and the control point means for determining at least one resonance point of

Art Unit: 2616

network performance metrics by scanning across a range of bandwidths until one or more of the network performance metrics is/are optimized as taught by Loguinov et al. in the communication method and apparatus of Rumsewicz being that it provides more efficiency for the system since the system can better optimize network performance in the communication network.

### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Duong-van et al. disclose a method for reducing packet loss and increasing Internet flow by feedback control.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shick C. Hom whose telephone number is 571-272-3173. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SH SH

*Seema S. Rao*  
SEEMA S. RAO 8/29/06  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600